

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Minutes of Workshop August 12, 2014

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:25 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk, on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Supervisors present in addition to Mr. Hawk were: William C. Seeds, Sr., William L. Hornung, Gary A. Crissman, and Robin L. Lindsey.

Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steve Stine, Township Attorney; Sam Robbins, Public Works Director; Steve Fleming, HRG - Township Engineer; Brian Luetchford, Parks and Recreation Director; Christine Hunter, H. Edward Black for Heroes Grove Committee; Eric Epstein and Ford Thompson, Central Dauphin School District Board Members; Jay Omslaer, Central Dauphin Transportation Director; Bill Yohn, Durham Bus; David Seaman, Partnership for Hope; and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

**Pledge of Allegiance**

Mr. Seeds led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Public Comment**

Request from Paxton Athletic Association, Linglestown Baseball Association, and CASA regarding Hurley Fields at the Public Works site

Mr. Wolfe explained that this item has been pulled from the agenda at the request of the organizations as they asked that it be tabled until the September workshop.

Continued discussion regarding a proposed ordinance  
to prohibit the parking of buses on public streets

Mr. Wolfe explained in the previous workshop session the Board developed an amendment to the Township's Codified Ordinances and it was detailed in Chapter 196.25 with two new subparagraphs titled C and D. He noted that the provisions for this draft indicated that "The parking of any vehicle registered in Pennsylvania as a school bus and possessing a gross vehicle weight in excess of 5,500 lbs. is prohibited on any and all public streets in any residential district according to the zoning classifications and regulations set forth in Chapter 203, Zoning and Land Use." He also noted that it states, "Vehicles registered in Pennsylvania as a school bus

and possessing a gross vehicle weight in excess of 5,500 lbs. may be temporarily parked on any public street within a residential district for the purpose of and while engaging in loading, unloading, and transportation of students.”

Mr. Wolfe noted that this ordinance was set for advertisement; however representatives from the Central Dauphin School Board have asked the Board not to proceed with the ordinance until they had the opportunity to discuss this with the Board. He noted that they are present this evening to discuss this ordinance.

Mr. Eric Epstein, Central Dauphin School District Board Member introduced Ford Thompson, President of the School Board; Jay Omslaer, Director of Transportation, and Bill Yohn who is a representative for Durham Bus Company. He explained that he raised the issue as the District has a concern that there are a number of different school buses that run through the Township that have nothing to do with the Central Dauphin School District. He noted that there are also different size school buses and routes as well. He noted that the concern is that the School Board was unaware of the issue, and if there is a way that it can help to resolve the issue, it will be happy to do it. He noted that there is also a potential for unintended consequences as some drivers have half day runs or Kindergarten runs so you may see a bus parked in a shopping center or a residential place because that is where they live. He noted that this saves the District money rather than driving the buses back to the barn. He noted that Central Dauphin is a huge school district with 10,500 students and that doesn't include the Dauphin County Technical School students. He noted that Bishop McDevitt High School is now located in the Township, so he would like to have an opportunity to address the concern to determine if it was coming from Central Dauphin, Boyo Transportation, Durham, Royer, or First Students. He noted that he also had concerns for extracurricular runs where at the end of the day when a driver comes home due to the weather or lateness, parks their vehicles residentially. He explained that the District uses park out locations to save funds by having a driver park a bus at their residence so they don't have to drive their vehicle all the way back to the barn.

Mr. Hawk noted that his only concern is that school starts the end of August which is very soon and people want the Board to adopt the ordinance but the earliest the Board will get to it at a workshop would be September.

Mr. Epstein questioned what specifically the issue is. Mr. Crissman noted that the impetus for this discussion does not concern the Central Dauphin School District buses. He noted

that the issue is with one of the private contractors who has a vehicle smaller than the regular 44 passenger school bus and a small van that is being parked in a neighborhood. He noted that residents have raised concerns about this, and it concerns one of the minor contractors for the School District.

Mr. Epstein noted that he does not know what the unintended consequences may be. He noted that the District transverses hundreds of thousands of miles a year and has fuel costs and safety and security concerns. He questioned if there is something the District can do to help with this issue. He noted that the District was unaware of the concerns as no one has brought the issue to the District.

Mr. Crissman suggested that indirectly this concerns the District as it may have to make a suggestion to a sub-contractor but beyond that it is not a school district issue in terms of the Township.

Ms. Lindsey questioned Mr. Wolfe if the Township has received any complaints for the larger school buses parking during the day in residential areas. Mr. Wolfe answered no, the only complaint that he has received was in regards to the Wooded Pond issue.

Mr. Epstein noted that there are economics and safety concerns related to the issue and it seems that this is one isolated incident.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Central Dauphin or Durham buses are parked overnight in a residential area. He questioned if they all return to the bus garage at night. Mr. Ford Thompson answered that he has school buses that are allowed to park at homes overnight but they have to be parked off the street on their private property. Mr. Crissman noted that the Middle Paxton Township drivers have been allowed to do this. He noted that it saves fuel not making them drive back and forth each day to the bus garage. Mr. Thompson noted that they start their routes in Middle Paxton Township and end their routes in that location. He noted that during the day there are times that drivers may need to go to the bathroom or get lunch and he questioned if they could be ticketed for doing this. He noted that sometimes they have some down time and they need to park the bus. Mr. Crissman noted that it is a short period of time when that occurs as many times they park in the shopping center. He noted that is not the issue that is being discussed at this time. Mr. Thompson had a concern that the amendment would become so restricted that they will not be able to allow their drivers to park in a residential area for a short period of time.

Ms. Lindsey noted that the Board is looking at buses that are parked for hours and hours in residential areas during the day as you have to worry about the street cleaners going around them and if it is snowing the plows need to do their job. She noted that since 2010, the Township demographics have been changing so this is a way to clean up the Township also. She noted that she would not want a school bus parked for six or seven hours on her street across from her house, noting that she would have to worry about backing out of the driveway. Mr. Thompson stated that he is in agreement with that.

Mr. Jay Omslaer, Central Dauphin School District Transportation Director, noted that he would not permit that to happen. He noted that occasionally you will see one of our buses parked in the outer area of a shopping center and he always instructs them to stay out of the normal concourse of business. He noted if a driver would drive back to Union Deposit and Rutherford Roads and they would only be there for 15 to 20 minutes that is not practical. Ms. Lindsey noted that the Board is concerned with residential parking. Mr. Thompson noted that he would agree with that.

Mr. Crissman noted that is why he explained that it is not Central Dauphin School District identified buses. Mr. Thompson explained that the he will carefully watch all their buses as he has total control for where the buses are, where the drivers are as they are always in communication with them through the radio system. Mr. Crissman noted that the impetus is from a private contractor. Mr. Omslaer noted that we do business with several vendors and if it is one of their vendors, he will pick the phone up and call. He noted even if a neighbor does not like a bus parked in the driveway, we will ask the driver to pull the bus back to the garage. He noted that we want to be good neighbors. Mr. Thompson noted that it sounds like it is one of our contractors and he will speak to them and have it stopped.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Thompson would have a driver park a Durham bus on a street in Lower Paxton Township overnight. Mr. Thompson answered that he would not. He noted that he will speak with the contractor about this and stop it.

Mr. Crissman thanked Mr. Thompson for his support.

Mr. Dick Wissinger, 1095 Wooded Pond Drive, noted that he drives for one of the subcontractors that they were talking about. He noted the reason he parks on Wooded Pond is that the Home Owners Association (HOA) bylaws state that you cannot park on private roads or in your driveway. He noted that the HOA told him that he has to park on a public road and that

is where he has been parking for around three years. He noted that the only reason that he has it parked out is because Boyo Transportation has so many vehicles and they don't have enough room to take the vehicles back to their garage. He noted that he has to park on the road someplace. He noted that the other vehicle is a shorty bus, a 15 passenger bus that would be parked in the area during the school year but it is not parked there during the summer. He noted that his vehicle is parked there all year since he transports special needs children, attending camp over the summer months. He noted that he parked across the street and up from where Mr. Sporik lives but he does not park by his patio. He noted that he did not know where else he could park.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the HOA does not permit Mr. Wissinger to park in his driveway. Mr. Wissinger answered that he is not allowed to park a commercial vehicle in the driveway or the overflow parking areas. Mr. Hawk noted during the summer do you keep the bus at home or does it go somewhere else. Mr. Wissinger answered that the bus goes back to Boyo Transportation but the van that he uses every day is parked there. Mr. Hawk noted that when he drove by the bus was not there, but he questioned if it could be parked on Hidden Lake Drive. Mr. Wissinger noted that it is parked on Hidden Lake Drive.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the yellow bus is parked at that location from September until June. Mr. Wissinger noted that it parked until the last day of school. Ms. Lindsey noted that she personally would not want it parked outside her home and she drove by yesterday and the van was parked right next to the person's patio. She noted that was the complaint the Board received. Mr. Wissinger explained that he parks across the street and up from Mr. Sporik's home. He noted if you look out his door you can see a long way up in both directions. He noted that he is not parked right in front of his door, and his vehicle was parked in that location when Mr. Sporik looked to buy the house.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that it was her understanding, before she came on the Board that the people who lived there before were complaining for two to three years to the Township about the same thing and they were told that nothing could be done. Mr. Wissinger noted when it came up at the Board meeting, he agreed that he would not park on that side of the street where the patio in question is. He parked the vehicles across and up the street. He noted when he first moved out to Hidden Lake, he was parking on the side that he is currently parking. He noted that there were complaints then from people that they could not see around the vehicles so they had the Police

Department put up signage stating, no park within 100 feet of the corner. He noted that is where he is parking now.

Mr. Hawk questioned if it would be reasonable for Mr. Wissinger to park where the school buses normally park. Mr. Wissinger noted that Mr. Sporik is complaining that he was parking in front of his patio, on the opposite side from where he is currently parking. Mr. Hawk questioned if he could take the van back to Central Dauphin School District. Mr. Thompson noted that he would not be permitted to do that.

Mr. Wissinger noted if he can't park his van at that location then he will lose his job. He noted that he only has one vehicle and there is no place that he can drive to as his wife needs the car. He noted if he moves the van up another 50 feet, if it will satisfy people, he would be willing to do that.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned Mr. Thompson if he would lease any of the ground at the School District. Mr. Thompson answered no. He noted that Boyo Transportation is a subcontractor and he will speak to them tomorrow to come up with a resolution for this and he will contact Mr. Wolfe to let him know the resolution.

Mr. Hornung noted if Mr. Wissinger would have done what he proposes to do, in the beginning, we would not be here. He noted if he would have listened to his neighbors and moved up out of the way, we would not be here and that is what gets him. He noted that people impact other people's quality of life and then the Township has to step in as a governing body to try to do something. He questioned why Mr. Wissinger didn't move the bus 50 feet in the other direction. He noted that now under the threat of shutting you down, now we get compliance. He noted that is the part that bothers him. Mr. Wissinger answered if the gentleman would have contacted him and tried to talk to him; he would see him when he got out of his vehicle and if he would have come over and said I have a real problem with this we could have resolved this somehow. Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Wissinger if he would have liked a van and school bus parked in front of his house. He stated that he did not think so. Mr. Wissinger noted that he drives a van. Mr. Hornung noted that you also drive a small bus and he would not want that parked in front of his house or his backyard as it is not an aesthetically pleasing thing to do to look out your house and see a bus. He noted the lack of consideration for your neighbor is the reason for us being here. He noted that is what is bothering him.

Mr. Wissinger stated if Mr. Sporik had come to him and said I am having a real problem he would have been willing to talk to him but he never did. Mr. Hornung noted that we always have that issue when people come in and want the Township to change things and we ask if they talked to their neighbor and if the neighbor knew there was a problem. He noted that we had gotten from Mr. Sporik that he had somehow made it known to you and that there was a petition. He questioned Mr. Wissinger if he knew about the petition. Mr. Wissinger answered that he did not know about the petition. He noted that he did not stop at his house or Mr. Kastelic's house either. He noted that if he would have known about it he would have been present at the first meeting.

Ms. Barbara Loomis, noted that she was present at the original meeting with Mr. Sporik and she explained that she spoke to Boyo Transportation. She noted that Mr. Sporik stated during the previous meeting that everyone was aware that there was an issue with this. She noted that there was quite a fight in the neighborhood about it and with the Association. She noted that Mr. Wissinger had parked the van across the street and now it is at her property. She noted that she had some landscaping done to try to hide some of that and moving it up has only put the vehicles more in front her property where he mother is living and it is still a problem. She noted that she tried contacting Boyo Transportation and the person that she spoke with eventually hung up on her.

Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Thompson stated that he would make a phone call to Boyo Transportation to resolve the issue and he will then return a phone call to Mr. Wolfe regarding this matter. He noted that it should resolve the issue. Ms. Loomis thanked the Board for addressing this issue.

Mr. Al Sporik, 1001 Wooded Pond Drive noted that he introduced this request for an ordinance. He noted that his problem is not with anyone but it is with the Township allowing a bus to be legally parked on a Township road. He noted that Mr. Wissinger has been parking in front of his patio the entire time and there is nothing that he can say to him because he is legal. He noted that is why he came to this Township and the Supervisors because he as a citizen had no right to tell him what to do. He noted that it is a public street and he can park on it as vans and buses are allowed. He noted that the reason for the ordinance is not only for him but for everyone in the Township to prevent anyone from parking a bus in front of their house and there is nothing anyone can do about it. He noted that is the reason he introduced the ordinance. He

noted that other boroughs and townships do not allow it and he does not want Mr. Wissinger to lose his job but Boyo Transportation can have him park his bus at the school district and solve that problem. He noted that buses should not be parked in a residential area. He noted that he should not have to look out his window and look at a bus in a residential area and that is the basis of his argument. He stated that you five people here can change that; he can't do anything about it. He noted that he has nothing against anyone trying to make a living or the school district. He noted that he understands the economics of what is going on and he does not think that the people in the Township should, for a couple of dollars, have to look at a school bus parked in front of their house.

Mr. Hornung noted that he agrees with Mr. Sporik but when we get to the point where we are writing and enforcing an ordinance, that costs everyone taxpayer dollars; however, if it takes a neighbor walking over to a neighbor and asking please don't do that, to him that is the first order of business. He noted that no one should have to look out their patio door to see a school bus but many times these issues can be resolved by neighbor to neighbor. He noted if it can't then we have to get involved but that is the first order of recourse. He noted why we can't go to the neighbor and ask them first, knowing that sometimes you get an angry response but when customers come into his store and they tell me about a problem that they have with a neighbor he encourages them to go over to the neighbor and talk to them. He stated that he will do nothing until they have tried that first. He noted that many times that solves the problem rather than having the Board to write an ordinance that will cost taxpayers money.

Mr. Sporik noted that he agreed with Mr. Hornung but if all his neighbors previously couldn't do anything who am I, someone special and he is going to change the ways that he is going to do things. He noted that talking wasn't going to do any good and if they did not change to an 86 year-old woman who pleaded with them as it was his understanding from her daughter that she asked for them to move the bus and they would not move it, who am I to do anything. He noted that his only recourse was to come to the Township.

Mr. Seeds noted that many of the members of the Board have been on it for a long time and before Mr. Sporik brought this to the attention of the Board last month he was not aware of the problem. He noted that the Board has to be careful in enacting ordinances as they cost money and the Board does not want to become a Police state. He noted that we would rather have people talk to others and work together and if we put a strict restriction on all buses traveling



down the street, noting that Mr. Thompson stated earlier that some drivers may stop to the use the facilities or for lunch, he noted that we must be careful how far we go with things like that. He noted that Mr. Sporik has a problem that looks like it will be worked out but to become a police state and say flatly you can never park a bus, we have to think about the big picture too. He noted that the big picture is the transportation of children whether they are in school or special needs, thinking of all those things, not just what you or I see outside our window. He noted that the Board was not aware that there was a problem until a month ago.

Mr. Sporik noted that Mr. Thompson mentioned that a driver may park at a shopping center as it is commercial and if someone stops to go to the bathroom, it is one thing, but being overnight or sitting for three hours is not called for in a residential area. He noted that people walk, they don't want to see buses. Mr. Seeds suggested if anything it should be for long-term or overnight parking but not flat out stopping from buses from being able to park along a street all day, 24/7. He noted that it would be impossible to enforce.

Mr. Crissman repeated that Mr. Thompson, the President of the Central Dauphin School District Board has graciously consented to make phone calls tomorrow morning in an attempt to resolve the issue and he will then call Mr. Wolfe with the results. He noted that is the best that we can do right now.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Sporik is stating that he would like to see a restriction for the entire township. Mr. Crissman noted that he is not in favor of that. Mr. Seeds agreed. Mr. Sporik noted in a residential area, noting that it is not only him, anyone, anyplace could have a bus parked in front of anyone's home. He noted that for the many homes that he stopped and talked to, no one wants to see it, so how is the Board going to resolve this issue and future issues if you don't have an ordinance that they are not allowed to park in a residential street. He noted that is why he introduced it and it has nothing personal to do with anyone. He noted that it is for the good of the community and it will prevent future problems.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Crissman summed up his feelings as he trusts that Mr. Thompson will handle this.

Mr. Wissinger noted where he is parked now is near a common area near the gazebo in his development. He noted when it is going to snow the bus and van are moved to the overflow parking area for overnight and after the road is plowed they move the vehicles back to the road. Mrs. Lindsey questioned Mr. Wissinger if he is not allowed to park in the overflow parking area

all the time. Mr. Wissinger answered that is true. Mrs. Lindsey questioned if that is part of the HOA rules. Mr. Wissinger answered yes.

Mr. Thompson noted that he will resolve this issue to the Township's satisfaction and he will get back to Mr. Wolfe with an acceptable solution.

Review of the revised License Agreement and  
Temporary Access Easement for Heroes Grove

Mr. Stine noted that there was an issue with access to the area where the Heroes Grove construction project will be as well as where the people visiting the site will park. He noted that he drafted a license agreement for parking in the Colonial Commons Shopping Center, some time ago, as well as a temporary access agreement that would allow construction vehicles to go through part of the Colonial Commons to get down to the site. He noted that he received a response from the shopping center owner, providing comments for both agreements that were relatively minor in nature and he incorporated them into the license and temporary access agreement easement that Ms. Hunter is preparing to send off for execution.

Ms. Christine Hunter, H. Edward Black and Associates, noted that she has received agreements that have been reviewed by the Shopping Center representatives and have been reviewed by Mr. Stine. She noted that she wanted the Board to review the agreements as they are looking for the Board to approve the agreements in the form that they are in now. Mr. Crissman noted that they would need to sign the documents before he would approve them. Ms. Hunter questioned if she could tell them that the Board has approved the agreements but that the Shopping Center must sign the agreements first. Mr. Crissman noted that he is fine with that noting that our counsel has reviewed the agreement and recommended that it is acceptable.

Mr. Seeds questioned why it states that it is a revised agreement. Ms. Hunter answered that the Shopping Center's legal counsel made some revisions which Mr. Stine incorporated into the agreement. He questioned if there was an agreement before this one. Ms. Hunter answered that there was one before, noting that Mr. Stine drafted an agreement and sent it to the Shopping Center owners and they revised it and those changes are now incorporated in the final draft. Mr. Seeds noted that this is only for Phase I of the construction. Ms. Hunter explained that it is for a limited license for parking. Mr. Seeds noted that it is for Phase I construction. Ms. Hunter answered no, it is for public parking for the project. Mr. Stine noted that it is for parking for the proposed project all the time, not just Phase I construction. Ms. Hunter explained that there are

two agreements; one is a temporary access for Phase I but the limited license for parking in the front is... Mr. Stine stated for as long as they allow us to be there. Mr. Wolfe suggested that Mr. Seeds is looking at the next item agenda for engineering design services. Ms. Hunter noted that the temporary access for construction is for Phase I. Mr. Seeds questioned if there are two agreements. Ms. Hunter answered yes. She noted that the license agreement is the most important one as the construction plans do not show access through the Shopping Center.

Review of a proposed agreement with H. Edward Black and Associates for preparation of Heroes Grove Phase 1 construction documents

Mr. Wolfe noted in accordance with the Heroes Grove project and funding streams for the project it will be necessary for the Township to engage the services of H. Edward Black and Associates for engineering and design services. He noted that a proposal has been submitted by Ms. Hunter providing for the preparation of construction documents, electrical engineering design, shade structure design, bid coordination, miscellaneous services, and surveying services. He noted that the total cost of services is approximately \$70,000 and these fees would be a reimbursable expense in accordance with the grant sources that have been received by the project to date. He noted that Ms. Hunter is available to answer any questions.

Mr. Wolfe noted that this item would have to be placed on a business meeting agenda.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the \$70,000 comes out of Heroes Grove funds but the Board has to approve it because the Township is the government entity that owns the land. Mr. Wolfe noted that all the grant agreements from the governmental sources come to the Township for the project. He noted that the non-profit cannot spend the funds, only the Township can. Mr. Crissman noted that they must submit the bills to the Township to seek reimbursement. Mr. Stine answered that is correct. Mr. Wolfe noted if the Board is comfortable with this he would put it on the agenda for the August 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Mr. Seeds noted that up until this point, Ms. Hunter has done all the work pro bono. Ms. Hunter noted that there is significant construction drawings, and liability issues going forward.

Mr. Hawk noted that it is exciting that we have gotten to this point after how many years. He noted that it should be put on the agenda for the meeting next week.

### Review of bids to manage placement of clean fill at the Wolfersberger Tract

Mr. Wolfe distributed additional paperwork in regards to the agenda item. He explained that the Township has been implementing efforts to develop the Wolfersberger Tract as a clean fill site for the material generated in the sanitary sewer mini-basin project. He noted that it was hoped that the sanitary sewer mini-basin fill disposal costs for each of the contracts executed by the Authority or the Township on behalf of the work would offset or pay for the fill necessary to fill the Wolfersberger Tract. He noted that Mr. Fleming had prepared bid specifications for the fill of the site in accordance with the master plan prepared for the site last year and he opened the bids last week and is here to discuss it this evening.

Mr. Fleming noted that last Tuesday, staff opened seven bids to manage the placement of clean fill and install certain stormwater features and access roads as necessary to accommodate the placement of the fill which would deliver a rough graded site to the Township utilizing fill material generated by the sanitary sewer projects. He noted, of the seven bids, JVH provided the low bid of \$1,092,196.33. He noted that the other bid ranged up to a high of \$2.8 million. He noted that the engineer's estimate for the project was \$1.9 million. He explained that the low bid was actually substantially less than his engineer's estimate, although the range of the bid was in line with the estimate. He noted that he contacted the low bid contractor to ensure that they did not make any errors and that they were comfortable with their bid and they assured him that they were.

Mr. Crissman noted the suggested bid award lists \$600,000 to do the north side, would it also go to JVH. He noted that he did not see a break out for that piece. Mr. Fleming answered that Mr. Wolfe's summary was based upon a meeting staff had earlier today looking at strategies with available funds and how the project could potentially be segmented. He noted that the recommendation is to move forward with the project and award to the low bid contractor JVH Excavating in the full amount of \$1,920,196.33.

Mr. Seeds noted that they are asking for \$600,000 for the north tract. Mr. Fleming noted that it would be a partial award.

Mr. Wolfe suggested taking one step back, noting that the issue we have before us is that we had always known that we had material generated by the sanitary sewer and it ended up in many places in the Township, including people's backyard that caused stormwater issues for other people. He noted that in some locations it was improperly placed and without erosion and

sedimentation control plans and permits. He noted as the projects expanded, staff began chasing clean fill material all over the Township. He noted that we have a need to fill the Wolfersberger Tract to develop it as a park site. He explained, 18 months ago, staff developed the plan to put the two together and come up with a way to fill the Wolfersberger Tract through the sanitary sewer contact projects. He noted that the Authority has four upcoming projects in the next two years that generate 150,000 cubic yards plus or minus of fill. He noted that the north side of the Wolfersberger Tract needs approximately 150,000 cubic yards of fill. He noted that staff has done an extensive analysis of what it costs the contractors to dispose of the materials, and the analysis is attached to the information. He noted that Mark Hilson, the Authority Engineer determined that the cost is approximately \$2 per cubic yard. He noted if you take the 150,000 cubic yard and multiple it by \$2 per cubic yard, you are only looking at \$300,000. He noted that staff added a 20% mark for the Township charge to the Authority as part of the management agreement. He noted that the total cost to the Authority would be \$360,000 to utilize the fill site at the Wolfersberger Tract. He noted that the Township would get the fill material placed and have the benefit of developing ball fields and courts. He noted that staff never determined what the over/under for this project would be. He noted that we now know that we can recuperate \$360,000 from the Authority but for the north side we know that the cost would be \$600,000 to the Township so the end result is that we can't do it status quo, we can't do it to make money, but if we do it the cost to the Township would be roughly \$240,000.

Mr. Hornung questioned how we recuperate the \$2 per cubic yard. Mr. Wolfe answered that we bill the Authority and the Authority directs the contractor to go to the fill site and in turn we assume that they get better bid prices. He noted that we are not overcharging them based upon the analysis. He noted if you do this as a bid breakout, it would not work as the contractors bid these numbers all over the place. He noted that they may bid a paving number real high and another number low to hide their profit in other places. He noted that you can't put this as a bid breakout number because one contractor could have it at \$200,000 and another at \$5,000 and the \$5,000 contractor would be the low bid and it doesn't work. He noted that we came up with an analysis determined through the past contracts what the estimated cost would be and it is about \$2 per cubic yard.

Mr. Hornung questioned how many cubic yards are in a tri-axle truck. Mr. Fleming answered about 14 cubic yards. Mr. Hornung noted that the contractors are getting rid of dirt for

\$28 a tri-axle load. Mr. Fleming noted on average; noting that Mr. Hilson's analysis wasn't based upon the cost of the disposal but on the savings of the number of tri-axes that they would need for the project. He noted if they had to contract with three subcontractors for a typical project where they would have to haul to a fill site on Paxton Street or West Hanover Township, because of the time it would take for a round trip, this site being closer to the project and managed by the Township would recognize a savings of approximately one truck per contract. He noted that extending this across the duration of the contract, number of days etc. and applying the costs of that subcontractor, we came up with \$2 per cubic yard amount.

Mr. Wolfe noted that staff believes that it is a fair amount.

Mr. Seeds questioned if he did the engineering for both tracts of land for the fill. Mr. Fleming answered that he designed a plan for the southern tract but it is bisected into a north and south. Mr. Seeds questioned if the north tract is the one closest to Wenrich Street. Mr. Fleming answered that the tract that the Township is looking to fill is the tract of land closest to Wenrich Street, there is a northern tract of land that the paintball business is on. He noted that is a northern tract but not involved in this project. Mr. Wolfe explained that it is not a part of this project at all. He noted that we are only talking about the 45 acres along Wenrich Street and it has been divided into a north and south. He noted that we did not engineer the area where the paintball is located. Mr. Fleming noted that we will provide access to that area.

Mr. Seeds noted that this splits the front tract of land into two sections. He noted that the south side is a cut and fill project and will require the removal of 30,000 cubic yards of fill at \$500,000. He questioned if the fill is taken from the south side, where will that fill be put. Mr. Wolf noted that the 30,000 cubic yards is something that we can address at a future point in time. Mr. Seeds questioned why you would not take that 30,000 cubic yards and put it in the north side instead of hauling more ground there. Mr. Wolfe answered because it would cost \$500,000 to get to the 30,000 cubic yards. Mr. Fleming noted that the thought is that the bids that we received, at this point, we would not touch that southern project knowing what the costs are to the Township; however, we could revise that plan to get rid of that 30,000 cubic yards access by lowering some grades or doing those types of things. Mr. Seeds noted that you do not know where you are taking the 30,000 cubic yards of material. Mr. Wolfe noted that we may do that on site and revise the plan.

Mr. Seeds questioned how many acres is the north side of the front tract. Mr. Fleming answered that it is about 25 acres, with the total land area being about 100 acres. Mr. Seeds questioned if it would cost \$600,000. Mr. Wolfe noted that was correct for all fill. Mr. Fleming noted that it was offset by \$360,000. Mr. Seeds noted that \$360,000 would come out of the Sewer Authority budget and the \$240,000 would come out of the Township. He noted that we have to find that money in 2015 budget. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township would have two or more years to do that. He noted that it would be a staged process, noting that it will not happen all at once. He noted that it will follow the sanitary sewer mini basin projects; two are going to bid now and two others will be bid in 18 months.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the entire front section cost \$1.9 million. He noted that is where the contractors move the ground around. Mr. Fleming answered that they will clear and grub the land, put in basins, silt fence, certain infiltration BMP's that are required, cut swales, stabilize the site, place the fill, push it off and compact it, install access roads with Township providing the millings and they will control the site for the two-year period. Mr. Seeds questioned if the Township would provide the stone. Mr. Fleming answered yes.

Mr. Seeds questioned when the sanitary sewer contractors provide the fill then the contractor who we are looking to award this bid to would come in with their equipment and put it wherever it should go. Mr. Fleming answered that we would work with the sewer contractors to direct their trucks to an area and they would dump the material on a pile and do it sequentially across the site and then staff would call JVH, if they are awarded the contract, to come out and push the piles off in a level manner and compact it and then we would move on to the next row.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Fleming if he thinks this is a fair bid. Mr. Fleming answered that the Township got very good pricing on the bid.

Mr. Seeds questioned if we should award the first part for \$600,000 and let the other part of the parcel go for a later date. Mr. Fleming noted that we would have to execute a change order to remove that from the contract.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the contractor would have a problem with that. Mr. Wolfe noted that we would have to check to see if they would have a problem and if the Board was okay with this change since we have not awarded anything at this point. He noted that the Board may want to award the entire thing or not want to do anything.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the contractors sell the dirt now. Mr. Wolfe noted that they try to get rid of it anyway possible and frequently it ends up in inappropriate locations. He noted in at least three occasions the Township had DEP do investigations into the fill placement of contractors on sanitary sewer jobs. Mr. Hornung noted that he was a part of one of those investigations. Mr. Wolfe noted that it will eliminate that for those projects under contract with the Township. Mr. Fleming noted before we started this project, we did some poling of site work contractors to get a feel for how this would work out because we have done projects where we paid to import materials and ones to export materials and the thought is that someone pays on both ends with the contractor being in the middle so what is the real cost. He noted that there are excavating contractors that are paying to get rid of material from the projects and generally what he was told is that they bid the project and make an assumption, put a cost into the contract and try to minimize it. He noted if they can find a less expensive way to handle that their efficiency is their return.

Mr. Hornung noted that there are less and less people in the Township that want fill as they have all they need. He noted that many times it ended up inappropriately in wrong places with the property owners being responsible to fix the problem. He noted that this situation did not always work out well for the property owners. Mr. Fleming noted that the strategy behind the fill site is if you are going to charge the contractor you are giving them the opportunity to increase their efficiency and they repay the Township for it and this is how they would do that.

Ms. Lindsey noted if the Board does not award the entire contract at this time and remove the south side, do we have to go back through the bid process again. Mr. Fleming answered yes unless the Board elects to award the entire project. Mr. Wolfe explained that he hopes to be able to award the contract and execute a change order at the same time to reduce the scope of work. He noted that it would have to be acceptable to JVH.

Mr. Wolfe noted if they are not agreeable to that then we will have another issue. Mr. Crissman noted that we will find that out before we take action next week. Mr. Fleming noted when he reached out to the bidder to determine if they were comfortable with their bid he had some discussion with them about possible changes to the contract and they seemed to be receptive to modifying the contract as long as it is a two-way discussion. He noted that they may ask for some scheduling concessions. Mr. Crissman suggested that they would be flexible as it is a nice contract to receive.



Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the Township has ever used this contractor before. Mr. Fleming answered no, but he has had experience with them in the past and had no problems with them. He noted that they are a very reputable contractor. Mrs. Lindsey questioned where they are located. Mr. Fleming answered Lemoyne; mainly operating in Cumberland, York and Perry Counties. He noted that they explained that they had an internal competitive advantage that others did not as they focus on mining and understand how to move material and they feel that they have some equipment that would be more efficient.

#### Review and ranking of Dauphin County Local share grant applications

Mr. Wolfe explained that Dave Seaman is present from the Partnership for Hope to make a presentation for why the Board should sponsor their Dauphin County Local Share Gaming Grant application.

Mr. Seaman explained that his organization provides care for homeless families as they return to housing and it seeks wherever it can to help these people get back on their feet. He noted that they also provide support and services for accountability to ex-offenders as they reenter the community. He noted a few years ago the organization began an effort to support these individuals as they have nothing when they return to housing. He noted that he has established relationships with retailers, stores like Bed, Bath and Beyond, and other chains stores through which he has collected \$3 million worth of basic necessities. He noted that it went beyond the initial scope of the organization programs and he has since extended these basic needs to other participants to help ex-offenders and homeless families. He noted that he is seeking support for infrastructure costs to continue these projects. He noted that he has provided over two dozen organizations with these basic needs and is seeking funding to pay for a delivery truck, noting that all the costs to date have been out-of-pocket. He noted the rental, insurance costs and contractual agreements and staff time has been voluntary. He noted that he is seeking to build on the efforts of the Capital Area Coalition for Homelessness to provide some technology support. He noted that the mission is to bring some collaborative effort between these organizations noting that he serves many of the homeless shelters as well as the organizations that provide assistance to ex-offenders. He noted that his request is for infrastructure by way of trucks, storage areas, sorting materials, and a computer system that will bring us all together.

Ms. Lindsey questioned how long the Partnership for Hope has been in business. Mr. Seamen answered about three years, noting that they were officially incorporated in August 2010.

She questioned if the Colonial Club Drive address was run out of Mr. Seaman's home. Mr. Seaman answered no as the organization was created by New Hope Church. Mrs. Lindsey noted that it is based out of that church.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Partnership for Hope receives any funds from the United Way. Mr. Seaman answered no, only through payroll designations. He noted that they have applied to that organization but there is a lot of demand for funding.

Mr. Seeds questioned what percent of the money the organization receives goes toward helping people and how much are the administrative costs. Mr. Seaman answered that it is 6% for administrative costs. He noted that they have received in-kind office space and rent out very inexpensive storage units. He noted that the costs to deliver materials are about 2% of the funds. He noted that 80% of the organizations fees are supplied by private donations.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there was a lady present a month ago seeking support for another organization. Mr. Wolfe answered that was Contact Helpline seeking \$13,000 in support for computer equipment. Mr. Seeds noted that it was not listed on the agenda. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Board already approved that organizations application, but it will have to rank it along with the other organizations.

Mr. Wolfe questioned how much Mr. Seamen was requesting for your grant application. Mr. Seaman answered \$81,000.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the church supports the organization as part of their mission. Mr. Seaman noted that they no longer support us. He noted that they had a graduating scale for their support to us.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if we could be provided a list of who you have helped out or donated to. Mr. Seaman answered yes. Mrs. Lindsey noted if Mr. Seaman could provide the list to Mr. Wolfe it would be good to know where the money is actually going.

Mr. Wolfe noted he has three other applications to present this evening. He noted that they are all Township requests. He noted that the first is a request of \$250,000 to be used for engineering, architectural services and permitting for the addition and renovation to the Public Works Building. He noted that the Township has borrowed funds for this project, an amount equal to \$4 million; however, additional project funds will go to making a better project.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the other two applications are from the Friendship Center, one is for the natatorium lights noting the Mr. Luetchford could talk more about those lights. He noted that

the lights over the wet space in the pool are problematic and staff would like to replace them with LED lighting at a cost estimate of \$20,000. He noted that the Friendship Senior Center flooring is an issue that is a concern to the seniors. He noted that staff has looked at flooring options and believes that it can replace the flooring or about 50% of the Senior Center at a cost of \$20,000 using in-kind services for installation with the new flooring addressing the seniors needs while still being athletic flooring.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the lighting needs in the natatorium and flooring needs are both issues that have come up recently. He noted that the lights in the natatorium have been a consistent maintenance problem. He noted the only way to access the lights is by draining the pools although it is still difficult to get to the lights by either a ladder system or scaffolding. He noted that it is very expensive to set up and it could damage the flooring of the pools. He noted that he has worked with various lighting companies in order to gain access to the lights by way of using ladders and paying two and a half times the normal rate for service noting that they have informed staff that this is the last year they will maintain those lights. He noted that he is looking to make the changes in order to convert lighting to LED lights that will last much longer versus the current incandescent lighting that is currently being used. He noted that he is only concentrating on the 12 lights that are over the pool area. He noted that it would be a gradual process to replace the rest of the lighting in the natatorium.

Mr. Seeds noted that the lights that you want to replace now, you have to empty the pool to do it so do you would do it in August when you do the cleaning. He questioned if you get the grant for the new lighting, you will still have to empty the pool to install the new lights. Mr. Luetchford noted that once they are installed they will not have to be changed for many years. Mr. Seeds noted that there is no difference in how a contractor would have to change the lights. Mr. Luetchford noted that we need to access the lights as there is no mechanism to pull the lights to the side or do something else. He noted that we have to have light directly into the pool so the lifeguards can see to the bottom of the pool. He noted that direct lighting is very important and they have looked at other options but this seems to be the best option.

Mr. Hornung questioned since it will be a different fixture he will have to do this when the pool is empty. Mr. Luetchford answered that is correct. Mr. Hornung noted that he would caution Mr. Luetchford that LED lights provide a different light spectrum. He noted that it can conflict with the incandescent lighting. He suggested that when picking the new lights, they

should match as closely as possible the existing lights. He noted if you mix them up they tend to blend in but if you put them in one area they can be very noticeable and it can become annoying. He noted when you pick the light bulb; pick something that does not conflict with the other light fixtures. Mr. Luetchford questioned if he was speaking to color renditions. Mr. Hornung answered yes, noting that it happened to him at his store that some fluorescent tubes were changed to daylight and others to regular and it was very annoying to his customers. He noted that the LED lights can be the same way.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the senior citizens have been complaining about the rubber flooring in the East Annex and others have complained about it too. He noted that the rubber is sticky by nature and going sideways you can catch your ankle and turn it. He noted that it is very hard for the seniors to move the chairs over the surface so he is looking at different options, a padded dance floor type flooring to replace the current rubber that is there now. He noted that this grant would help to afford to make the change. He noted that the seniors were awarded a \$700 grant and some of those funds could possibly go toward this.

Mr. Seeds noted that it was not that long ago that the flooring was put in. He questioned if there is a problem when they move chairs. Mr. Luetchford answered that there are multiple problems with people who are trying to move their walkers, they have issues. He noted that there is such high friction that people have trouble lifting and rolling a walker, pulling back a chair, and people moving sideways in aerobics classes can catch their foot on the rubber matting. He noted that those kinds of issues can make it problematic and he is looking for a floor that would be better for everyone involved.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if all of the black rubber will be taken up. Mr. Luetchford answered that is the intention. Mrs. Luetchford questioned if the athletic floor that you are looking at, will it be a wooden floor with padding. Mr. Luetchford noted that we do not have an exact manufacturer yet, but it should look like a dance floor, with a wood look.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that they will work on this after September 1, 2015 and complete work by August 31, 2015. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would make the corrections for both applications.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the \$20,000 is not realized, what will happen with the floor.

Mr. Hornung noted that there is no funding and we would have to start looking for another alternative. Mr. Crissman noted that he wanted to clarify the total amount needed to rectify the situation as the \$700 or \$800 that the seniors already received in another grant won't cut it. Mr. Wolfe noted that this will depend on in-kind services for installation, with having staff install the floor.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that some seniors don't attend the center because they are on walkers and the walkers do not work on that floor, so it is something that definitely needs to be taken care of. Mr. Crissman noted if we are going to do this, it needs to be done as a priority.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the last application from Dauphin County Planning Commission is a request for assistance in the update of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board members must rank all six projects in order of importance. Mr. Seeds suggested that the Board members rank the projects on a piece of paper and let Mr. Wolfe calculate the numbers.

Mr. Hawk noted that the six items are the Dauphin County Comprehensive Plan, Partnership for Hope, Public Works Improvements, Senior Center Floor at FC, FC natatorium lights, Contact Helpline. At this point all five Board members wrote their rankings on a piece of paper. Mr. Hornung questioned what the amounts were for each application. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Township is requesting \$250,000 for the Public Works engineering and architectural services; FC natatorium lighting, \$20,000; FC Senior Center flooring, \$20,000; Contact Helpline, \$13,000 for computer equipment; Partnership for Hope, \$82,000 for storage and deliver of materials and computers; and the Dauphin County Planning Commission has not listed a dollar amount.

Mr. Seeds requested Mr. Stine to calculate the ranking for each item.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Stine has the results from the ranking for the Gaming Grants.

Mr. Stine noted that the Public Works application received six points; FC Center Senior Center Floor received 14 points, FC natatorium lights received 17 points; Contact Helpline received 19 points, Partnership for Hope received 23 points; and Dauphin County Planning Commission Comprehensive Update received 26 points.

Mr. Hornung questioned why the highest ranked item had the lowest number. Mr. Stine explained that you ranked them in order so the lowest number would be ranked first.

Continued review and development of the Strategic Plan as it applies  
to the General Fund budgets for each of the next five years

Mr. Wolfe noted he has attached in the packet the most recent version of the Strategic Plan as prepared by Board and staff. He noted that the last time it was presented it had the one year cost, five year cost and total cost for implementation. He noted that he has broken the plan out into budget years which is a refinement and if the Board is comfortable with this refinement he would use the 2015 numbers for preparation of the budget as well as the refinement of the 2016-2019 numbers. He noted this is a theoretical impact upon the Township finances and each number is an additional cost to the Township for the projected item over and above what we currently spend. He noted that the higher ranked numbers, typically one through fifteen, are in year one or two, which is years 2015 and 2016 and the lower ranked numbers down to number 40 are in the out years which would be 2017 through 2019. He noted that he tried to book logical items together and also to spread out certain items such as the three planning studies indicated within the strategic plan, one a fire services study, Township Comprehensive Plan update and recodification of Township ordinances.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would like the Board members to review 2015 numbers noting that he proposes two additional police officers in 2015 and then two additional in 2016. He noted that stormwater improvements are funded by bonds through to 2017. He noted that hiring an additional codes enforcement officer has been pushed to 2016. He noted that the public works building improvements is funded by bond funds. He noted that the public works operations supervisor is programed for 2015 with Information Technology investments at \$75,000 per year. He noted that Wolfersberger fill project was thought to be a project net-no cost but will now have a cost of \$125,000 in 2015 and the same in 2016. He noted that the fire services study is projected at \$50,000, and Parks and Recreation equipment replacement at \$75,000 per year. He noted that replacement of in-car computers with tablets would be done in 2016. He noted that police canine services would start in 2015 at a cost of \$115,000 and carried it through all five years of the plan. He noted that the replacement of in-car video equipment is a three year spend for \$35,000 for the next three years. He noted that the Board wants to commit an additional \$50,000 each year for the Fire Equipment Capital Plan, adding to the current \$200,000 contribution. He noted the Nyes and Devonshire Roads project is projected to \$200,000 in 2016 and 2017.

Mr. Wolfe noted hiring an additional public works laborer would amount to one hired in 2015 and the second in 2016. He noted that additional paving money and the succession plan have no costs as the paving funds would be coming from the increase in Liquid Fuels revenues from the State which will increase by 60% over the next few years.

Mr. Wolfe noted that it is estimated to cost \$1.5 million to complete George Park and is programed for years 2016 through 2019 with the primary costs coming in 2017 and 2018. He noted that the enhancement of the PEG channel is estimated at \$50,000 for each year of the plan. He noted that there is no cost estimate for Colonial and Valley Roads, but he plugged funds in 2017 and 2018 at \$150,000 each. He noted that the MS4 program is funded through bond expenditures; however the Spring Creek Road solution has not been budgeted into this program as of this date. He noted that there is no expectation to do anything in 2015 suggesting that it would be an out year project. He noted that implementing the Greenway Plan is estimated at \$500,000 with the Township's share at \$250,000 starting in 2016 and finished in 2017.

Mr. Wolfe noted that traffic signal equipment upgrades have a 20% share on a \$1 million project that is programed for 2016 and 2017 or maybe later. He noted if an early retirement is offered it would be a no cost. He noted that implementing ADA improvements is an additional \$50,000 for each year of the plan. He noted that the reverse 911 as well as additional enhancements for Facebook and Twitter feeds is estimated at \$20,000 per year for each year. He noted that there is no impact for Jonestown Road and the Comprehensive Plan is moved to 2016. He noted that equipping police officers with tazers was moved to 2018 budget year. He noted that North Mountain Road at Blue Ridge Avenue is out to 2018, with the recodification of Township Ordinances moved to 2017.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there are no cost estimates for the purchase of Mateer Field, and paving the Linglestown Alleys has been moved to 2018. He noted that ADA improvements in parks has been programed at \$100,000 for each year of the plan. He noted that the Red Top Road Bridge is programed for 2016 and 2017 at \$200,000, although it may be a 2017 and 2018 year project. He noted that the Wolfersberger Park Development is estimated at \$1.3 million with payments in 2018 and 2019. He noted that the Board discussed Compost Facility equipment at an earlier workshop session adding \$150,000 to the 2015 budget. He noted that the Koons Park Parking lot is programed out to 2019 at \$250,000. Mr. Seeds questioned why he had 50% of this

funded and where would the remainder of the funds come from. Mr. Wolfe answered from DCNR funds, a grant staff would have to apply for.

Mr. Wolfe noted that this is a work in progress but if you look for how it stands now to implement 2015 projects, the Strategic Plan cost is \$895,500 plus the amortized debt that was borrowed this year of \$205,668 providing a total amount of \$1,101,168 which is equivalent to an increase in real estate taxes of .7 mills taking the Township's total tax rate in 2015 to 1.67 mills.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Hornung requested a history of the Township's real estate tax rate and he distributed to the Board members that information as well as the 2014 rate of taxation for municipalities within Dauphin County.

Mr. Hawk noted that the tax rate was cut in half in 2002. Mr. Hornung noted that was due to the new assessment rates.

Mr. Wolfe noted if the Township moves to 1.67 mills in 2015 in comparison to the large townships in Dauphin County, Susquehanna is currently at 3.2 mills, Swatara Township is almost 3.8 mills and Derry Township is 1.54 mills.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the full impact of the Strategic Plan would not set in until 2016 where the Plan costs an additional \$1,839,500 in addition to the bond issuance of \$499,783 providing a total funds of \$2,339,283 resulting in a .78 mill increase providing a total millage rate of 2.08 mills. He noted for 2017 the rate would be 2.25 mills, in 2018 it would be 2.23 mills and in 2019 it would be 2.16 mills. He noted that the out years are nebulous in how the projects are moved around, and what grant funds are received. He noted that he would be most concerned about 2015 as well as 2016 because much of the Strategic Plan costs are personnel related that are staggered to get the full impact for personnel in 2016.

Mr. Wolfe noted that staff will be moving forward to prepare budget documents per this plan for future Board discussion.

Mr. Hawk noted when you lump the County, Municipal and School District taxes there are only two townships that have a lower millage rate than Lower Paxton Township, Middle Paxton Township and West Hanover Township.

Mr. Wolfe noted that it is not fair to throw darts at other municipalities in regards to tax rates, but the neighboring large townships have other sources of revenue not available to Lower Paxton Township. He noted that Derry Township has an amusement tax that generates significant revenue, Swatara has a business privilege tax, and Susquehanna Township has an



occupational privilege tax, none of which the Township has. He noted that the Township has the earned income tax, real estate tax and local services tax and that is it.

Mr. Seeds noted that Swatara Township has a business privilege tax. He questioned how much that is. Mr. Wolfe answered that he did not know. He questioned if it is 1%. He noted that he could find out what it generates. Mr. Seeds noted that he would be interested in knowing that.

Mr. Hawk noted that Elizabethville is almost 5 mills, Highspire is at 16 mills, and Paxtang Borough is at 11 mills.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that the early retirement issue would be a cost savings to the Township and she is concerned that in the next two or three years a large amount of people will be leaving at the same time taking with it all the expertise, and if we don't do something now, in two to three years it will be gone. She noted that is something that we need to think about.

Mr. Hawk noted that he did not follow the cost for the canine services for the Police Department. Mr. Wolfe explained that initially you would have a new police officer which has a lower cost that increases rapidly over time. He noted for the initial year you have the cost of the dog but it is a onetime cost.

Mr. Seeds noted that there are letters under services on the county wide list of municipal taxes, and he questioned what it means. Mr. Crissman noted that there is a narrative at the bottom of the page describing the meaning of the notations. Mr. Wolfe noted that they are charges for specific items but he does not know what they are. He noted that some municipalities charge their garbage rate in a lump sum added to the tax bill.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned what the occupational privilege tax generates in a year. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it was about \$250,000 and it cost a high percentage to collect, like 10%.

Mr. Hawk questioned when Mr. Wolfe expected the retirements to kick in. Mr. Wolfe noted that we have a large number of employees that over the next five years will be eligible but he can't guess when they will be retired. He noted that there is a large group between the ages of 55 and 60 that exists in this Township workforce.

Mr. Crissman noted that the information was very comprehensive noting that it is good to compare the data.

Mr. Wolfe noted that unless the Board directs him otherwise, staff will begin to prepare the 2015 budget including the 2015 projects that were identified this evening.

Mr. Hawk noted that many people don't realize that in 1988 the Township tax was 1.49 mills and now it is 1.3 mills. Mr. Seeds noted that we are less than we were in 1988. Mr. Hornung noted that it was before the reassessment conducted by Dauphin County and if you compare it to today's statistics we are actually higher than we were in 1988. He noted that the 1.3 mills that we are at now would be equal to 2.6 mills.

Mr. Hornung noted by going with this plan, we are agreeing to a tax increase of .37 mills and another .78 mills in addition to the .37 mills for 2016 and then another tax increase of .95 in addition to the two prior tax increases for 2017 with a slight decrease for 2018 and 2019. He noted that is what we are agreeing to if you allow Mr. Wolfe to move forward with budget preparations. He noted that he is not in favor of doing this. Mr. Crissman noted that just because he has bought into the concept it does not mean he will support every item on the list for budgetary considerations. He noted that there may be other items in the proposed budget that he may or may not support. Mr. Hornung questioned if we should review the projects to determine what should be included in the 2015 budget. He noted that he wants to reduce Mr. Wolfe's workload, rather than have him prepare a budget that might be changed. He suggested that the Board should give him more direction for what it wants to do in 2015. He noted that some projects he may not want to fund in 2015 while he might want to stretch out other projects longer to reduce the tax increase. He noted that typically we have four or five years with the same tax rate and he questioned if we should increase it a lump sum at one time and not for each year thereafter. He noted that the Board has never increased taxes five years in a row.

Mr. Crissman noted if that is the approach then there are some items that will come off completely or get pushed back beyond 2019.

Mr. Wolfe noted that this is a healthy discussion and he suggested that the Board consider involving the Department Directors in this discussion and suggested that we could have an early start next Tuesday, at 6 p.m. to have a special workshop session to discuss the Strategic Plan and 2015 budget. Mr. Hornung agreed that it would be a good idea as it is easy to look at what you want to have but it is much more difficult when you get to the bottom and look at the costs. He noted that the Board can dissect it individually and look at the end and say that is all we are going to pay for or raise taxes by a certain amount and fit everything into it.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would prefer a more definitive direction from the Board before staff embarks on the budget preparations. Mr. Hornung agreed. He noted that a lot of work goes into that and if it is for not, it is a waste of time.

Mr. Hawk noted that staff does not want to keep redoing the budget.

Mr. Seeds noted that the only tax that we have to raise is the real estate tax, but there are other alternatives and that is why he asked about the business privilege tax. Mr. Wolfe noted that Lower Paxton Township is not eligible for a business privilege tax. He noted if you don't have it you can't enact it. Mr. Stine noted that this happened some years ago when they repealed the tax. Mr. Wolfe noted that we can't adopt it. Mr. Stine explained that the Township is permitted to enact real estate taxes, emergency services tax and 1% earned income. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board can only increase real estate tax rate. Mr. Stine noted unless you become a distressed municipality there are no other means.

Mr. Hornung noted with the amount of money put into the sewer he thinks we are distressed.

Mr. Crissman noted that we should have the workshop meeting next Tuesday night to further discuss the budget and Strategic Plan. Mr. Hawk noted that there are several items on the list that he is not ready to support at this time. Mr. Hornung suggested that everyone review the list in the next week prior to the next meeting.

#### Review of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Key Indicator Report

Mr. Wolfe noted that the 2014 budgets are as follows:

- General Fund revenues and expenditures of \$19,662,475
- State Aid revenues and expenditures of \$1,007,280
- General Improvement Fund expenditures of \$1,731,557
- Friendship Center Operating Fund revenues of \$2,250,904 and expenditures of \$2,265,454
- LPTA Operating Fund budget revenues of \$13,800,000 and expenditures of \$27,150,388
- LPTA expenditures for capital projects of \$14,746,500

He noted that the 2014 beginning balances are as follows:

- General Fund balance of \$7,187,495
- General Improvement Fund of \$2,741,785
- Fire Equipment Capital Fund balance of \$979,360
- LOSAP fund balance of \$379,973
- Friendship Center Capital Fund balance of \$60,660 and the Operating Fund balance of (\$36,553)
- LPTA Fund balance of \$22,977,547
- Pension fund balances of \$31,943,851

Mr. Wolfe noted that the historical trends for the Township have been:

- Prior to 2008 – growth in revenues and expenditures as the Township addressed increasing demands for municipal services.
- 2008 to 2011 – the “great recession” caused reductions in municipal services in response to diminished revenues.
- 2012 & 2013 – moderate rebound in revenues, but not to pre-recession levels.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the municipal debt is as follows:

- In 2012, the Township issued \$2,000,000 in new debt for municipal capital projects. I
- In 2012, the Township received a PA Infrastructure Bank (PIB) loan in the amount of \$750,000 for road maintenance and improvement projects.
- In 2013, the Township issued \$4,000,000 in new debt for capital projects.
- In the 1st quarter of 2014, the Township issued \$7,000,000 in new debt for capital projects.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the General Improvement Fund expenditures over the past 5 years are as follows:

- 2013 - \$1,619,479
- 2012 - \$2,078,509
- 2011- \$1,071,041
- 2010 - \$1,070,034
- 2009 - \$1,273,680
- **5-Year Total: \$7,112,743**

Mr. Wolfe noted at the beginning of 2014, the General Fund balance was \$7,187,495, and by policy, 25% of the \$19,662,475 budgeted for expenditures is \$4,915,619. He noted at the end of the 2nd quarter of 2014, the fund balance was \$7,888,590.

Mr. Wolfe noted that General Fund revenues were \$9,515,576 and expenditures were \$8,814,481, producing a net gain of \$701,095. He noted that General Fund revenues were 3% (\$250,473) lower in the second quarter of 2014, compared to 2013, primarily due to 2014 Real Estate Transfer Tax receipts being \$302,570 lower in 2014 compared to 2013. He noted that General Fund expenses were 11% higher in the second quarter of 2014, compared to 2013, partly due to an auditor required adjustment from 2013 to 2014 of \$255,195.

Mr. Wolfe noted for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter State Aid, municipalities are required to use Liquid Fuels Tax receipts for local roads and the beginning balance for on January 1<sup>st</sup> was \$235,438. He noted that revenues were \$1,126,813; expenditures were \$386,455 leaving a balance on 6/30/14 of \$975,796. He noted that a significant amount of this will be spent in the third quarter on road paving projects.

Mr. Wolfe noted that journal entries for the Fire Equipment Capital Fund are made in the 2nd quarter. He noted that the beginning balance on 1/1/14 was \$979,360 with revenues of \$204,265 and no expenditures, leaving a balance on 6/30/14 of \$1,183,625.

Mr. Wolfe noted that journal entries for the LOSAP Fund are made in the 2nd quarter of this year, and as of 6/30/14, 10 members were receiving a monthly LOSAP benefit. He noted that the beginning balance on 1/1/14 was \$379,973, with revenues of \$81,756 and expenditures of \$6,540 providing for a balance on 6/30/14 of \$455,189.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the General Improvement Fund is for one-time capital projects and 2014 expenditures for capital projects are budgeted at \$1,732,000. He noted that the beginning balance on 1/1/14 was \$2,741,785, with revenues of \$139,407, expenditures of \$189,994 providing a net of (\$50,588) and a balance on 6/30/14 of \$2,691,198.

Mr. Wolfe noted for the Friendship Center revenues were \$1,015,206 and expenditures were \$1,030,542, producing a net loss of \$15,337. He noted that FC revenues were 2% lower compared to 2013 and expenses were .3% higher compared to 2013. He noted that the Operating Fund is expected to generate \$170,000 to fund the Capital Reserve Fund, however, in 2014, the Township will transfer \$292,454 transfer from the General Fund to the Center; composed of the \$100,000 annual contribution, \$25,000 to offset Senior Center expenses, and \$167,454 to smooth the debt.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Lower Paxton Township Authority operating revenues were \$12,011,770 and expenditures were \$3,693,189. He noted that capital expenditures were \$5,102,094 with the Authority experiencing a net gain of \$3,216,487. He noted in the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter the Authority borrowed \$25 million for continuation of the multi-year I&I Pro

Mr. Wolfe noted that this concludes his quick summary of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Key Indicator Report.

Review of bid specifications for the lease of Township facilities for attachment of small cellular telephone antennas

Mr. Wolfe noted that he was approached by a subcontractor for Verizon who would like to utilize municipal facilities, primarily traffic signal light standards as an example to mount small cellular antennas that work in groupings to add volume capacity to their cellular transmission systems. He noted that they will be very small and almost unnoticeable unless you

go out to look for them. He noted that they would be standing four or five feet above a street light or a traffic signal light standard.

Mr. Wolfe noted for the Township to be allowed to be paid to use municipal facilities the Township must have a competitive bid. He noted that he and Mr. Stine have prepared a bid document to bid facilities in municipal right-of-ways and municipal property to be use used for these micro cell antennas. He noted that bids are to be submitted to the Township by Monday, September 8<sup>th</sup> and then provide them to the Board at the following business meeting for action. He noted that the bids are structured so that a successful bidder would provide a generic lease agreement and lease payment for all Township facilities and then enter into a site specific lease agreement for each location that they desire to locate an antenna. He noted that he has been told by the contractor for Verizon that they are looking at seven or eight locations in the Township to install these types of antenna. He noted that the Township could potentially generate \$10,000 to \$20,000 a year on the lease agreements. He noted that the bid is on the street and if you find it not to be acceptable you don't have to accept it. He noted that he hopes to receive more than one bidder.

Mr. Hornung questioned if Verizon was awarded the bid, would they then be able to sublease it to other providers. Mr. Wolfe answered that there are provisions in this agreement that govern the subleasing of facilities. Mr. Stine noted that it basically says that they would need the Township's approval unless they are subleasing it to one of their subsidiaries or a parent company. Mr. Hornung questioned if we could ask for additional money at that point. Mr. Stine noted that we might be able to. Mr. Hornung questioned if it would have to be rebid. Mr. Stine answered that he did not know if that would require a rebid.

Mr. Seeds questioned if it is legal for the Township to do this. Mr. Stine answered yes as long as we competitively bid the project. Mr. Seeds questioned if there would be any problem with PennDOT. Mr. Stine answered that they are the Township's facilities. Mr. Wolfe noted if a highway occupancy permit is required then the bidder would be obligated to get that. Mr. Seeds questioned if the lease would be for a term of so many years. Mr. Stine answered that it is a total of 25 years but it comes in five year increments. Mr. Seeds questioned if we could allow more than one for instance, such as Comcast and receive funds from more than one. Mr. Wolfe noted if they would all bid, we could. Mr. Seeds questioned if we could allow for more than one

antenna on a site. Mr. Stine noted that they can't interfere with each other and it would be awarded to the highest bidder.

Mr. Crissman noted if Verizon gets the bid, if they want to subcontract some of it to Comcast, that won't fly but he understands that it would be for a subsidiary. He questioned if after the bid is reviewed, can we negotiate. Mr. Stine noted that you can't negotiate a bid price. He noted that Mr. Seeds was asking if someone wanted to get the Township's permission to put an antenna up. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it would be a change order.

Mr. Seeds questioned if they could put them on other Township property such as in the parks. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mr. Stine noted that they need to mount them on something that is up in the air but not real tall, lower to the ground than normal. Mr. Wolfe noted that he believes that Verizon has installed these in the City of Harrisburg entering into a lease agreement with the City. He noted if you go to Philadelphia or New York, you will see these as they are common place on top of a light fixture or traffic signal. Mr. Stine noted that these antennas are for Broadband.

Mr. Hornung questioned if there would be more than one antenna. Mr. Wolfe answered yes noting that they work in conjunction to provide capacity since everyone has PDA's, so many electronic devices, noting that the issue is not range, rather capacity.

Mr. Hawk questioned if they would be mounted on top of buildings. Mr. Stine answered that it would be too high. He noted that they have to be fairly low to the ground. He noted that the signal does not go down, but out.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if Verizon would maintain the antennas or would they hire a subcontractor. Mr. Stine answered that he did not know. Mr. Wolfe answered that it would not be the Township. Mr. Stine noted that he did not know if the document addresses maintenance. Mr. Seeds questioned if there would be an interference with the Opticon transmitters that are already installed on the masts. Mr. Wolfe answered no as the emitters are mounted mid-intersection on the span facilities but these would not go on the arms or wires, only on the poles.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if we have any of these antennas in the Township at this time. Mr. Wolfe answered not on municipal facilities, but he did not know if there were any on private facilities he did not know.

Mr. Seeds noted if we put the bid out we would not have to award it. Mr. Wolfe answered that was correct. Mr. Hornung explained that the bids are already advertised.

Review of the Township's Property Maintenance Code as it relates  
to the cutting of weeds and grass on large tracts of land

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board asked staff to modify a proposed ordinance to amend how it addresses weeds. He noted that the proposed amendment is underlined in the ordinance and it states, "for the purpose of Section 302.4, all premises and exterior property shall be limited to the minimum lot area as required by the Lower Paxton Township Zoning Ordinance and to a setback of ten feet (10') outside the minimum lot area. Any part of the premises and exterior property in excess of the minimum lot area and the ten-foot setback area shall be exempt from the requirements of Section 302.4."

Mr. Seeds noted if R-1 is 20,000 square feet they would have to maintain that much. Mr. Wolfe noted plus the ten feet. Mr. Seeds questioned if the ten foot area be included in the 20,000 square feet maximum. Mr. Wolfe answered that it is in addition to the 20,000 square feet. Mr. Seeds suggested that it does not read that way. He noted that he would add 10 feet from the property line outside the minimum lot area. Mr. Stine noted that it already states that. Ms. Lindsey noted that it states outside the minimum lot area. Mr. Wolfe noted that it must state ten feet from the property line, outside the minimum lot area.

Mr. Wolfe noted if this is what the Board is interested in, he can advertise it for adoption during a future business meeting.

Declaration of Consolidation of Previously Subdivided Lots

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Declaration is for a consolidation of lots for Steven M. Graehling for tax parcel Nos. 35-018-081 and 35-018-228.

Mr. Crissman questioned if there is any reason why the Board should not approve this. Mr. Wolfe answered no.

Mr. Seeds questioned why the Board is doing this. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Board must take action to consolidate the lots. He noted that it is similar to an improvement guarantee and can be approved at this time.

Mr. Seeds questioned why the applicant is doing this. Mr. Stine noted that he wants to make a lot big enough in order to build something on it.



Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the declaration of consolidation of previously subdivided lots for Steven M. Graehling. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Adjournment

Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and the meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle  
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

William L. Hornung  
Township Secretary